THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF POWER IN THE MINISTRY OF ENERGY (SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI): (a) to (d) The installation of more gas based power plants by the NTPC would depend on the availability of gas on a sustained basis. Specific proposals in this regard would be considered after sustained availability of gas has been established.

Improving State Electricity Boards

894. SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN:
SHRI SHANKER SINH VAGHELA:

Will the Minister of ENERGY be pleased to state:

(a) what is the national average 'power load factor' (PLF) of State Electricity Boards and what is the PLF for each one of those SEBs where it is below the national average; and

(b) what special steps for modernisation/renovation and improvement of the SEBs have been taken in the last 3 years and with what results and at what cost?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF POWER IN THE MINISTRY OF ENERGY (SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI): (a) The All India average Plan Load Factor (PLF) of Thermal Power Stations during 1986-87 was 53.2 per cent. Details of State Electricity Boards whose PLF during 1986-87 was less than the national average are given in the enclosed Statement-I. (*See* below).

(b) Apart from the assistance being provided to the State Electricity Boards for improving performance of Thermal Stations in matters such as training of power sector personnel, procuring spare parts from foreign and indigenous sources, supply of requisite quality and quantity of coal, a Centrally sponsored Renovation and Modernisation scheme is being immplemented at 33 Thermal Stations including the States where the Plant Load Factor is below the national average. The details of the total sanctioned cost of R&M schemes and the total expenditure incurred till now in the States where the PLF during 1986-87 was below the national average is given in Statement-II. (*See* below) It is not practicable to identify increase in PLF on account of individual measures being taken on a continuous basis. The improvement in Plan Load Factor on account of the implementation of the R&M programme can only be assessed after its cmpletion.

Statement-I

Thermal P.L.F. of State Electricity Board less than the national average during **1986-87**

Boards/Undertakings	P.L.F.(%)
HSEB	33·8
UPSEB	40·8
MSEB	50.7
KPC	45·6
BSEB	33.3
OSEB	31·7
WBSEB	41·2
DPL	29.7
ASEB	18.5
National average	53.2

Statement-II

Details of sanctioned estimated cost and total expenditure incurred for R&M schemes at thermal power stations

(Where the PLF is less than the National Average during 1986-87)

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl.No.	Name of the SEB	Total cost of the R&M Schemes sanctioned.	Total expenditure incurred during the last 3 years (1984-85, 1985-86 & 1986-87) upto 31-3-1987.	Total expenditure incurred upto 30-6-1987
1	HSEB	6355.00	1810.02	1850.76
2	UPSEB	17955.11	5725.25	5863.39
3	MSEB	4525.05	1364.64	1404.35
4	BSEB	6726.00	1957.93	1996.57
5	OSEB	3615.50	827.47	1027.67
6	WBSEB	5773.00	1334.67	1336.44
7	DPL	2380.00	673.93	679.63
8	ASEB	810.00	622.88	622.88
	TOTAL:	48139.66	14316.79	14838.69

Bhopal Gas tragedy victims' cases

895. SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) what are the reasons for the delay in the settlement of the three-year old Bhopal Gas Leak Disaster case in which hundreds of people were killed;

(b) whether Government have any proposals to deal with the dilatory tactics of the Union Carbide Company which is trying to protract the Court proceedings; and

(c) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETROCHEMICALS IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI R. K. JAICHANDRA SINGH): (a) to (c) After the Bhopal Gas Leakage Disaster, a complaint was filed by the Government of India on behalf of the victims in the U.S. Federal District Court, New York against Union Carbide Corporation (UCC) claiming compensation. On a motion moved by UCC, this complaint was dismissed on grounds of forum non-conveniences subject to Union Carbide consenting to three conditions namely (i) to submit to the jurisdiction of the courts of India; (ii) to satisfy any judgement rendered against it by an Indian Court, and if applicable, upheld by an appellate court, where such judgement and affirmance comport with the minimal requirements of due processes; (iii) to be subject to discovery under the model of the United States Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

UCC after consenting to all the three conditions, subject to its right to appeal,